to release the final paper with her comments; and if it is possible for Dean of the School and President of the College to conclude that Mr. Martin and Ms. Littell fully explained Petitioner's questions when they had no idea about when, where and how they met Petitioner and what their explanations were? Or this Court may have to study Research Methodology and Program Evaluation before being able to answer the above questions or to review Respondents' policies? Besides making empty arguments, Respondents never dared to link their arguments with any concrete fact.

All the above facts directly reveal whether Respondents treated Petitioner fairly. If this Court addresses the above facts and issues with a simple yes or no answer, the instant case is solved without comparing "the substance of what Petitioner wrote to that of other students who were not dismissed..."as Respondents falsely suggested. [8]

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant this petition and directly address whether a college student's right to review a teacher's reason for the grade and to request a teacher's clarification about the comments on his work should be prohibited under the doctrine of academic freedom- a special concern of the first amendment, Ewing case law, and other federal case laws.

Respectfully submitted

Haiying Xi

Haiying Xi, Petitioner
213 S. 45th St.
Philadelphia, PA 19104

[8] Respondents' Brief In Opposition, page 11, paragraph 1